

REMARKS

Claims 15, 17, 19-28, 30, 32-38 and 40 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 31 is cancelled and claims 15, 17, 19, 28, 30, 32-38 and 40 are amended. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Specification Satisfies All Formal Requirements

The title is amended. No new matter has been added.

II. The Claims Satisfy All Formal Requirements

Claims 17, 19, 30 and 32-38 are amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been added.

III. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 15, 17, 19-23, 25-28, 30-36, 38 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,739,634 to Wakimoto (hereinafter "Wakimoto") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,111,356 to Roitman et al. (hereinafter "Roitman"); claims 24 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wakimoto in view of Roitman and further in view of JP 10-36487; and claims 15 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Wakimoto in view of Nagayama. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Wakimoto does not disclose an electroluminescent device, including a thin-film layer provided above the light-emitting layer and overlapping the bank, as recited in claims 15 and 28.

Instead, Wakimoto discloses a cathode 1, an electron-injecting layer 6 and an emitting layer 3, 4, 5 located above an anode 2. However, Wakimoto is silent about pixel partitions such as a bank. See Fig. 3. Thus, Wakimoto does not disclose the electron-injecting layer 6b overlapping a bank. See Fig. 3.

The Office Action asserts that Roitman makes up for the deficiencies of Wakimoto. However, Roitman does not make up for the deficiencies of Wakimoto as discussed above.

Instead, Roitman discloses a cathode 32 located above anode 13 and insulating layers 14 in Figures 4 and 5. However, Roitman does not disclose a thin-film layer overlapping the insulating layer 14, and the cathode 32 provided above a thin-film layer. See Figures 4 and 5.

The Office Action asserts that JP 10-36487 makes up for the deficiencies of Wakimoto in view of Roitman. However, JP 10-36487 does not make up for the deficiencies of Wakimoto and Roitman as discussed above.

Next, the Office Action asserts that Nagayama makes up for the deficiencies of Wakimoto. However, Nagayama does not make up for the deficiencies of Wakimoto as discussed above.

Instead, Nagayama discloses a second display electrode 9 formed entirely on the ramparts 7 and the organic function layers 8. See Fig. 3, and col. 4, lines 34-40. However, Nagayama does not disclose a thin film layer located between the second electrode 9 and the organic function layers 8, and that a thin film layer overlaps the ramparts 7.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 28 are distinguishable over the applied art. Claims 17, 19-27, 30, 32-38 and 40, which depend from claims 15 and 28, are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 15, 17, 19-28, 30, 32-38 and 40 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/cfr

Date: May 14, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
